PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
APPELFELD ZER LAW OFFICE
29 LILINBLUM
TEL-AVIV, ISRAEL 65133

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing *(day/month/year)*	21 SEP 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION
B-0026-0000	See paragraph 2 below

International application No.	International filing date *(day/month/year)*	Priority date *(day/month/year)*
PCT/IL04/01191	30 December 2004 (30.12.2004)	02 January 2004 (02.01.2004)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): G06F 11/30,9,12,14,15,32,173; H04L, 9/00 and US CL: 713/201,164,167,187,189;705/58,75;709/224

Applicant

APPLICURE TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

---

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

   ☒   Box No. I   Basis of the opinion

   ☐   Box No. II   Priority

   ☐   Box No. III   Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

   ☐   Box No. IV   Lack of unity of invention

   ☒   Box No. V   Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

   ☐   Box No. VI   Certain documents cited

   ☐   Box No. VII   Certain defects in the international application

   ☒   Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1*bis(b)* that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US	Authorized officer
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-8300	AYAZ SHEIKH Telephone No. (703) 305-3900

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

    a.   type of material

        ☐ a sequence listing

        ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

    b.   format of material

        ☐ in written format

        ☐ in computer readable form

    c.   time of filing/furnishing

        ☐ contained in international application as filed.

        ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

        ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Form PCT/ISA/237(Box No. I) (January 2004)

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 *bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1-20	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1-20	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-20	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Please See Continuation Sheet

Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 7 & 17 are objected to as lacking clarity under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) because the claims are not fully supported by the description. The application, as originally filed, did not describe: Claims 7 and 17 recite the limitation "sign in parameters" the specification doesn't describe the details of the "session sign in parameters".

Claims 8 & 18 are objected to as lacking clarity under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) because the claims are not fully supported by the description. The application, as originally filed, did not describe: Claims 8 and 18 recite the limitation "initial session type parameters" the specification doesn't describe the details of the " initial session type parameters ".

Supplemental Box
In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:
Claims 1-20 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Carter et al. US 2003/0051026.

Regarding claims 1 & 11: Carter discloses a security system for preventing unauthorized processes activities within a network server environment (*Page 10, Paragraph 168*), wherein each process is associated to at least one identified communication session (*Page 21, Paragraphs 341 & 349 / session ID*) and the process authorization is determined in accordance with predefined rules (*Page 26, Paragraph 393*), wherein said rules refer to the properties of the identified communication session (*Page 25, Paragraph 383 / Rules defining the processes access*).

Regarding claims 2 & 12: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising of a filtering module installed on each server for blocking unauthorized processes activities in accordance with determined authorization (*Page 36, Paragraphs 655, 657 & Page 48 Paragraph 984 / a sub-layer to block all processes associated with attacks by filtering out all IP addresses related to the process in the Process Matrix Vector*).

Regarding claims 3 & 13: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes at least one agent installed on one of the protected servers within the server network environment, said agent enables correlating between processes and sessions on different servers (*Page 36 paragraphs 653, 656 & Page 37 Paragraphs 665, 667 & 671 / Commander, Demons, KnS, Agents and angels perform correlation and access control*).

Regarding claims 4 & 14: Carter discloses thee system of claim 1 wherein for each process an identification code of the identified communication session is added to the process information vector (*Page 23, Paragraph 363 / Process ID PID*).

Regarding claims 5 & 15: Carter disclose the system of claim 4 wherein the identification code replaces redundant information in the process information vector (*Page 21, Paragraphs 341 & 342 / PID vector*).

Regarding claims 6 & 16: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the processes are associated to the identified communication session by a unique process identifier (*Page 21, Paragraphs 342,346*).

Regarding claims 7 & 17: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the identified session properties are sign in parameters (*Page 21, Paragraph 349*).

Supplemental Box
In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Regarding claims 8 & 18: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the identified session properties are initial session type parameters (*Page 21, Paragraph 351 & Page 23 paragraph 363*).

Regarding claims 9 & 19: Carter discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the identified session properties are hyperlink session address type parameters.

Regarding claims 10 & 20: Carter discloses the system of claim 6 wherein the communication session is identified according to a unique Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) port ID (*Page 21 Paragraphs 349, 350& 351*).

Claims 1-20 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4) and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.